

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Theological Students Fellowship (TSF) Bulletin (US)* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_tsfbulletin-us.php



BULLETIN

THEOLOGICAL STUDENTS FELLOWSHIP

SEPTEMBER-OCTOBER 1984

Vol. 8, No. 1

\$3.50

EDITORS

Mark Lau Branson
Thomas H. McAlpine

ADVISORY EDITORS

Clark H. Pinnock, McMaster Divinity College
Paul A. Mickey, Duke Divinity School

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Ray S. Anderson, *Systematic Theology*
Fuller Theological Seminary
Stephen T. Davis, *Philosophy*
Claremont McKenna College
Donald Dayton, *News Analysis*
Northern Baptist Theological Seminary
Roberta Hestenes, *Christian Formation*
Fuller Theological Seminary
Robert L. Hubbard, *Old Testament*
Denver Seminary

Stephen C. Mott, *Ethics*
Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary
Mark Noll, *Wheaton College*
Church History

Grant R. Osborne, *New Testament*
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School
David Lowes Watson, *Evangelism & Missions*
UMC Board of Discipleship

PERSPECTIVES EDITORS

Keith Bolton, Fuller Theological Seminary
Luis Cortes, Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary
Atlanta, GA
Nancy A. Hardesty, Mt. Paul Novitiate
Thomas F. Stransky, Harvard University
Sze-kar Wan, Harvard University

FACULTY CONTRIBUTORS

Bernard Adeney, New College, Berkeley
Donald Bloesch, University of Dubuque Theological Seminary
Geoffrey W. Bromiley, Fuller Theological Seminary
Harvie M. Conn, Westminster Theological Seminary
Charles Ellenbaum, College of DuPage
Vernard Eller, University of LaVerne
Elouise Renich Fraser, Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary
David Gill, New College, Berkeley
Larry Hurtado, University of Manitoba
Susanne Johnson, Perkins School of Theology
Richard Mouw, Calvin College
Richard Lovelace, Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary
PHEME PERKINS, Boston College
Bernard Ramm, American Baptist Seminary of the West
Gerald Sheppard, Union Theological Seminary
Charles R. Taber, Emmanuel School of Religion
Keith Yandell, University of Wisconsin

Letters to the Editor	2
Linking the Gospel and the Human Predicament: An Interview with Emilio Castro	2
Biblical Authority and Interpretation Randy Maddox	5
Women's Realities: A Theological View Linda Mercadante	8
From Knowledge to Wisdom: The Seminary as Dining Hall Hal Miller	10
How Ellul Transcends Liberation Theologies Thomas Hanks	13
The Politics of Biblical Eschatology: Ronald Reagan and Impending Nuclear Armageddon Larry Jones and Gerald T. Sheppard	16
Introduction to Francis Schaeffer's Jeremiad Ronald A. Wells	19
Francis Schaeffer's Jeremiad: A Review Article Ronald A. Wells	20
Early Christian Attitudes to War and Military Service: A Selective Bibliography David M. Scholer	23
News Articles A New Mission Agency in the United Methodist Church James Pyke	24
The Challenge of Missions History Richard Pierard	27
Sixth Evangelical Women's Conference Linda Mercadante	27
Review Article: A Christian Critique of the New Consciousness Douglas Groothuis	28
Book Reviews and Comments (Itemized on Back Cover)	31

ingness to be civilly disobedient, seem to be rather shallow in not taking these important matters into account.

Rather than "A Christian Manifesto," Schaeffer's book should have been called "A Fundamentalist Manifesto," because it bears all the marks of that unfortunate movement. Writing in this journal on the "new fundamentalism" (*RJ*, February 1982), George Marsden suggested, in a memorable phrase, that "the Moral Majority turns out to be something of Dooyeweerdianism gone to seed." If that be true, a reading of evangelical fundamentalism's leading thinker will help us understand why. It is cruelly ironic that evangelicalism's philosopher, who spent so much time on "the antithesis," winds

up a synthesizer after all. In this book we have a vintage blend of evangelical orthodoxy and the lore of one version of American history. This is a bitter recognition for some of us who, fifteen years ago, thought Francis Schaeffer was a leading light of a new movement in evangelicalism. With his atrophied view of "the antithesis" and his chauvinistic Americanism, Francis Schaeffer becomes less appealing the more he writes.

EDITOR'S NOTE: In a subsequent article (*Reformed Journal* 5/83) Ronald A. Wells responded to some critiques and misunderstandings of this article. Interested readers may wish to consult this piece.

Early Christian Attitudes to War and Military Service: A Selective Bibliography

David M. Scholer

- Bainton, R. H. "The Early Church and War," *HThR* 39 (1946), 189–212; reprinted in *The Church, the Gospel and War* (ed. R. M. Jones; New York: Harper & Brothers, 1948), 75–92, and as "The Pacifism of the Early Church," Chapter 5 in *Christian Attitudes Toward War and Peace: A Historical Survey and Critical Re-evaluation* (New York/Nashville: Abingdon, 1960), 66–84. One of the first of modern (Post World War 2) attempts to deal with the question. A basic article by a prominent church historian.
- Birley, E. "The Religion of the Roman Army: 1895–1977," *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt—ANRW II*, 16.2 (1978), 1506–41. While Birley does not deal directly with the question of early Christian attitudes, he deals indirectly with the question since part of the debate is the level of religious obligations assumed by soldiers. Best recent treatment of subject; written at a very technical, advanced level.
- Cadbury, H. J. "The Basis of Early Christian Antimilitarism," *JBL* 37 (1918), 66–94. A Quaker, early 20th century work. The arguments from many older articles (such as this one) have been picked up and refined, so in that sense they are primarily of historical interest.
- Cadoux, C. J. *The Early Christian Attitude to War* (London: Headley, 1919; reprinted New York: Gordon, 1975; reprinted New York: Seabury, 1982). Classic, but still important as a particular expression. For the sake of appreciating the early form of the argument, Cadoux and Harnack are the major tomes on the question, both fairly technical. Cadoux presents a very scholarly approach, but is operating somewhat out of pacifist assumptions (he has a commitment to argue that the church not be involved in military service).
- Campanhausen, H. F. von. "Christians and Military Service in the Early Church," *Tradition and Life in the Church: Essays and Lectures in Church History* (trans. A. V. Littledale; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1968), 160–170. Good basic survey article, position closer to Cadoux than Harnack.
- Case, S. J. "Religion and War in the Graeco-Roman World," *American Journal of Theology* 19 (1915), 179–99. By major scholar in early church history at Chicago. Of historical interest due to the date of publication and prominence of the author.
- Crossan, J. D. "Jesus and Pacifism," *No Famine in the Land: Studies in Honor of John L. McKenzie* (ed. J. W. Flanagan and A. W. Robinson; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1975), 195–208. Important essay because written by a modern gospel scholar.
- Ferguson, J. "Christianity," Chapter 7 in *War and Peace in the World's Religions* (London: Sheldon Press, 1977), 99–123 [99–106 through Constantine].
- _____. "Judaism," Chapter 6 in *War and Peace in the World's Religions* (London: Sheldons Press, 1977), 78–98.
- _____. "The Nature of Early Christian Pacifism" *Hibbert Journal* 55 (1956–57), 340–49.
- _____. "The Pacifism of the Early Church," Chapter 3 in *The Politics of Love: The New Testament and Non-Violent Revolution* (Cambridge: James Clarke/Greenwood, SC: Attic Press, n.d. [ca. 1974]), 53–67. Ferguson is clearly, polemically a pacifist. A scholar of the Greco-Roman empire, he writes in Greco-Roman religion and is trying to expose some of the data that the church was pacifistic. Of his articles listed here, this is the most important.
- Fontaine, J. "Christians and Military Service in the Early church," *Concilium* 7 (1965), 107–19. Fontaine attempts to provide survey of evidence. That is helpful because there is dispute over what the basic evidence is.
- Gabris, K. "The Question of Militarism at the Time of the Apostolic Fathers," *Communio Viatorum* 20 (1977), 227–32. Gabris deals with very limited fund of passages.
- Gero, S. "Miles Gloriosus: The Christian and Military Service According to Tertullian," *Church History* 39 (1970), 285–98. Gero, an early church historian, attempts a rereading of Tertullian, whose evidence is essential in the discussion. Very technical article, which critiques both pacifist and non-pacifist sides.
- Grant, R. M. "War—Just, Holy, Unjust—in Hellenistic and Early Christian Thought," *Augustinianum* 20 (1980), 173–89. This article summarizes pagan and patristic literature on the theory and actual conduct of war. One implication of the article is that Christians often opposed the way in which war was conducted more than the concept of war itself. The article does not deal with the "pacifist" issue in the early Church.
- Harnack, A. *Militia Christi: The Christian Religion and the Military in the First Three Centuries* (trans. and intro. D. M. Gracie; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981 [1905]). Harnack isn't afraid to acknowledge that the church got into the military, even though he thinks it wasn't a good thing. First major collection of the evidence in modern times. Harnack leans in a non-pacifist direction. Pacifists think Harnack has overstated his case.
- _____. "The Spread of Christianity in the Army," Book IV, Chapter 3, sec. 3 in *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the first Three Centuries, Vol. II* (2nd ed.; trans. and ed. J. Moffatt; London: Williams and Northgate/New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1908), 52–64. This entry covers only one particular point from the previous entry.
- Helgeland, J. "Christians and the Roman Army A.D. 173–337," *Church History* 43 (1974), 149–63, 200. This is the most sophisticated collection of evidence for Christians in the Roman army. Helgeland's position, that Christians didn't like the army not out of pacifism but because of the religious practices of the Roman army, is key in the modern discussion.
- _____. "Christians and the Roman Army from Marcus Aurelius to Constantine," *ANRW II*, 23.1 (1979), 724–834.
- _____. "Roman Army Religion," *ANRW II*, 16.2 (1978), 1470–1505. This entry is like Birley in terms of content.

- Hornus, J.-M. *It Is Not Lawful For Me To Fight: Early Christian Attitudes Toward War, Violence, and the State*. Scottsdale: Herald, 1980 [French 1960]. [Review by J. Ferguson, *Heythrop Journal* 23 (1982), 85–86.] A major presentation of the data by a pacifist who self-consciously is critiquing Harnack—as well as everybody else.
- McSorley, R. *New Testament Basis of Peacemaking*. Washington, D.C.: Center for Peace Studies, Georgetown University, 1979. Popular level.
- Moffatt, J. "War," *Dictionary of the Apostolic Church* 2 (ed. J. Hastings; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1918), 646–73. A famous NT scholar. This is the most hawkish of any of articles, as Moffatt presents the view that Christian entry into military service was quite unproblematic.
- Mott, S. C. "Pacifism? Come Now!" *The Other Side* 13:2 (July 1977), 74–69. *The Other Side* is responsible for the title. Mott's argument is that pacifists are reading the data too simplistically. A very basic-level starter article that presents the complexities of the issue.
- O'Rourke, J. J. "The Military in the NT," *CBQ* 32 (1970), 227–36. Harnack dealt with Jesus' relations to soldiers. O'Rourke deals with these texts.
- Ruyter, K. W. "Pacifism and Military Service in the Early Church," *Cross Currents* 23 (1982), 54–70. One of more current attempts to assess the complexity of the evidence.
- Ryan, E. A. "The Rejection of Military Service by the Early Christians," *ThSt* 13 (1952), 1–32. One of more current attempts to assess the complexity of the evidence.
- Swartley, W. M. *Slavery Sabbath War and Women*. Scottsdale: Herald Press, 1983. Limited to NT, takes these themes and shows how pro- & anti-people have used the same biblical passages, and what hermeneutical presuppositions are involved. Swartley tries to develop an appropriate hermeneutical stance.
- Swift, L. J. *The Early Fathers on War and Military Service. Message of the Fathers of the Church*, 19. Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1983. Helgeland and Swift are the two most significant contemporary scholars who are not self-consciously working out of the pacifist religious tradition. Neither are popular writers. Extremely valuable, now one of starting points for serious reflection. It is a translation of primary sources in English, approximately 100 passages from early church documents, organized primarily chronologically that have any bearing on the question of church participation in war or military service. Brief commentary on every single passage, showing very balanced judgment. This is the first and only collection giving all these passages in translation with commentary. Shows that it is very hard to prove that the church had an articulated position from which it fell.
- _____. "St. Ambrose on Violence and War," *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 101 (1970), 533–43. This entry is very specialized, dealing with the late St. Ambrose material.
- _____. "War and the Christian Conscience I: The Early Years," *ANRW II*, 23.1 (1979), 835–68. This is broader than Helgeland, who is only dealing with the army question. Foundational, absolutely essential survey.
- Zampaglione, G. *The Idea of Peace in Antiquity*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1973. Contains much valuable information on problem. An interesting source because Zampaglione is trying to talk about attitudes toward war outside the church.

A New Mission Agency in the United Methodist Church

By James Pyke

A significant and controversial event took place on November 2, 1983, in the life of the United Methodist Church. On that day in St. Louis, thirty-four ministers and lay persons unanimously voted to create an alternate mission sending agency. They represented some twenty conferences and all five jurisdictions of the Church.

The assembled ministers needed only a minimum amount of time to arrive at their decision. A paper by Dr. Gerald H. Anderson, a leading mission theologian of the Church, was ready; some vigorous opinions were voiced; but there was no doubt in anyone's mind that the need for the new agency was crucial. The discussion centered around the structure of the new organization, the possible reactions from the establishment of the Church and the immediate steps that had to be taken to bring the agency into being. As the news of the meeting spread across the Church, the foremost question in everyone's mind was: Why do we need a second mission agency?

The short answer to that question is that a growing number of persons, particularly the evangelically-minded, were becoming increasingly frustrated with the philosophy and the policies of the official mission agency of the denomination, the General Board of Global Ministries. A brief historical sketch will illustrate the problem.

New Direction

The stated purpose of Mission as set forth in the Discipline of the Church (which is normative for theology and polity) is: "The World Division exists to confess Jesus Christ as divine Lord and Savior to all people in every place, testifying to His redemptive and liberating power, and calling all people to Christian obedience and discipleship."¹ In contrast to this, there began to emerge in the late sixties and early seventies what came to be known as "Liberation Theology." Springing from Latin American roots, it emphasized the socio-political aspects of the Gospel. This perspective, reinforced by the strongly perceived nationalism of the Third World churches,

captured the attention of mission executives of most of the mainline churches. For example, in an article that appeared in the house organ of the GBGM² of the United Methodist Church, written by Dr. Tracey K. Jones, the General Secretary of the Board, made the following points: no longer should the Christian mission emphasize Jesus as Savior, or men and women as either "saved" or "lost," but rather Christ as Lord over all men and that all men are to become a "new humanity" in Jesus Christ. The arena of missionary activity should be the liberating of persons from degradation, war and hunger and empowerment of the weak and disinherited.

Those in the Church who adhered more closely to the classical Wesleyan tradition began to fear that a new concept of mission was taking shape, what they started to refer to as "Missions without Salvation." To them it appeared that this "new look" in missions was going to vitiate the very basis of the Gospel as they found it in the Scriptures. They discerned that under the new rubric, mission was to proceed from God's sovereign activity in the world rather than from Christ's Great Commission. The goal seemed to be a this-worldly one of perfect peace and prosperity for mankind. The "new look" meant participating with God in His intervention in world events to overcome evil institutions. To the evangelicals, this meant that the Church was no closer to God than the world, and that the frontier between the Church and the world, between the "saved" and the "lost" had been erased. In this view God no longer held out a universal call to mankind to cross the frontier between death and life. This, according to the opposition, was a "beautiful but unBiblical" idea, for it allowed no understanding of God's gracious provision of salvation and man's response to it. They say the new concept was making Christ Lord only without first being Savior. He was a "Man for Others," the Lord of history with His Incarnation nothing more than His presence within that history.

To Methodists of a more orthodox persuasion, this new trend seemed to be leading the mission of the Church to a place where